CITY OF LODI

COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

AGENDA TITLE: Consider certifying the City of Lodi's compliance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP) of San Joaquin County for the period January 1, 1992 (date the CMP first went into effect) to June 30, 1992

MEETING DATE: July 15, 1992

PREPARED BY: Community Development Director

RECOMMENDED ACTION: That the City Council consider certifying that the City of Lodi is in conformity with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) of San Joaquin County.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On January 1, 1992, the San Joaquin County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) became operative for all jurisdictions in San Joaquin County. This state mandated program was adopted in an attempt to improve congestion on San Joaquin County's highways and major roads and also to improve air quality in the county.

State law requires a CMP to be created and for local compliance with the CMP to be annually monitored. The program is linked *to* new gasoline tax revenues which local governments receive under the provisions of Propositions 111 and 108, approved by the voters in June 1990. Failure to comply with CMP requirements can jeopardize the City's share of these new revenues.

The San Joaquin County CMP has a self-certification program to determine conformity with the CMP. Annually, each jurisdiction *must* fill out a check list and certify that they are in compliance. The check list must be accompanied by a Certification Statement adopted by the local jurisdiction's governing board, stating that to the best of its knowledge, the jurisdiction is conforming with the CMP.

The annual monitoring to determine compliance will take place in September *of* every year, with the compliance material due by July 31 each year. Because the CMP program went into effect on January 1, 1992, this first review will only cover the period from January 1, 1992 through June 30, 1992. The Community Development Department has determined the City is in compliance with the CMP and recommends that the City Council consider certifying the City's conformity.

FUNDING: None required.

David Morimoto for

James B. Schroeder
Community Development Director

JBS/cg
Prepared by David Morimoto, Senior Planner
Attachments

APPROVED. Thos. A. Peterson

THOMAS A. PETERSON
City Manager

recycled paper

CCCD92.14/TXTD.01C

Certification Statement

Staff

This 1992 self-certification was prepared by:
(year)

David Morimoto
Name

Community Development , City of Lodi
Department, Jurisdiction

(209) 333-6711
Phone Number

Based upon the self-certification checklist and the attached documentation, staff is of the opinion that City of Lodi has conformed to the requirements of the
(jurisdiction)
Congestion Management Program.

By: David Morimoto
(Signature)

July 8, 1992
(Date)

Governing Body

The _____ has reviewed the completed checklist and
(governing body)

supporting documentation and has found that the policies and actions of the jurisdiction as reported herein comply to the requirements for conformance with the Congestion Management Program for San Joaquin County.

Certified: _____ Date: _____

Title: _____

Attest: _____
City/County Clerk

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PLAN
Self-Certification Checklist

Designated CMP System

1. Are there any principal arterial segments that might be considered for addition to the CMP regional transportation system? If yes, please add to the attached conformance documentation.

No.

Level of Service Standards

2. Are all level of service calculations for principal arterial segments for which the jurisdiction is listed as "lead entity" (or which fall primarily within its jurisdiction) included in the attached documentation?

Yes. See attached A-1 and Table 1

3. Do any of these calculations indicate a LOS below the standard before interregional travel has been removed?

No.

4. Are all facility changes that may affect level of service calculations on the CMP system included in the attached documentation?

N/A

Transit Standards

5. Is all information verifying compliance with routing, frequency and coordination standards included in the attached documentation?

No. Lodi currently meets the City's transit needs by providing general public dial-a-ride service. This service is available weekdays from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and weekends from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The service is available to the general public, although the majority of riders are elderly or handicapped certified. The average daily trip count for 1991 was 310 passengers.

The City has recently received a Transit Needs and Assessment and Systems Plan done by a consultant. The City is in the process of evaluating the report to determine the direction of future transit plans. The City will probably phase into a fixed-route bus system over a 4-6 year period. This will be done in conjunction with an expansion and modernization of the dial-a-ride system. Attached is a copy of the recommendations made by the transit report (attachment B-1). This will be the basis for future transit discussions.

6. Are there any standards that the jurisdiction is having difficulty complying with or believes that it should not be required to comply with? If so, explain in the attached documentation.

Yes. Because the City of Lodi does not have a transit system other than dial-a-ride, it is difficult for the City to respond to many of the transit based standards. The City is currently studying expanded transit service for future years.

7. Have policies for facilities coordination, new/reconstructed streets and long-range transit needs been adopted by the jurisdiction as of June 30, 1992? Will implementation policies proceed according to a regular schedule after that date?

No. The City has not adopted specific transit standards as of June 30, 1992. This is in large part due to the fact that the City has just recently received a draft of the "City of Lodi Transit Needs Assessment and System Plan" report. Once this report is analyzed and discussed, the City will be in the position to adopt specific long-range transit standards. Once this is done, the City will also adopt a specific time table for implementation of the adopted policies.

Land Use Analysis Program

8. Have all land use decisions requiring CMA review been submitted to the CMA as part of the local environmental review process? (e.g. General plan amendments with 1,000 or more additional average daily trips, general plan revisions, cumulative total of all general plan amendments).

Yes. The City of Lodi has not processed any General Plan amendments that exceed the 1,000 or more additional ADT's threshold.

9. Have all significant impacts of the individual 1,000 additional trip general plan revisions been mitigated? Has documentation of the proposed mitigations and their estimated costs been submitted to the CMA?

N/A.

Trip Reduction and Travel Demand Element

10. Is a description of all transportation control measures in place or underway included in the attached documentation?

No. The City of Lodi is waiting for Transportation Control Measures (TCM) plan being prepared by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Once this plan is published and adopted, the City will adopt a trip reduction ordinance.

Capital Improvement Program

11. Is a list of all projects requiring state Flexible Congestion Relief, Traffic System Management or Urban Commuter Rail funds included in the attached documentation? Jurisdictions may also wish to include projects applying for Transit Capital Improvement program funds on this list.

    No. No projects are currently being funded by this program.

12. Is a list of all projects on the CMP system that the jurisdiction believes will increase roadway capacity or person capacity (transit) included in the attached documentation?

    N/A.

13. Is the information in these project lists given in the Regional Transportation Program format, in priority order, with estimated costs and **all** proposed funding sources?

    N/A.

Regional Model Analysis

14. Does the jurisdiction wish to use its own regional model to perform CMP forecasts and analysis? If so, has the CMA approved the use of the model?

    No.

Deficiency Plans

15. Has the CMA indicated that the juri diction must prepare a deficiency plan for a current or projected level of service deficiency? If so, please list the segments(s) for which a plan was required and when the plans(s) were submitted to the **CMA.** Were these required plans accepted by the **CMA?** If no, explain **why.**

    No.

LOS Calc. Sheet

Hutchins Street - Harney Lane to Kettleman Lane

Use urban, two-way arterials, Group C

AWT

S/Kettleman Lane 14,991

1992 Median AWT = 14991

LOS A (per Table 1)

Lower Sacramento Road - Kettleman Lane to Turner Road

Use urban, two-way arterials, Group B

AWT

S/Vine Street 12,413

1992 Median AWT = 12,413

LOS B (per Table 1)

Table 1

GENERALIZED DAILY LEVEL OF SERVICE MAXIMUM VOLUMES FOR FLORIDA'S URBAN/UREANIZED (5,000+) AREAS

(valid for use from January 1989 through December 1990)

TWO-WAY ARTERIALS

Group A (0.0 to 0.75 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	13,700	15,000	15,600	16,500	17,400
4 Div.	29,800	31,900	33,000	34,900	36,700
6 Div.	45,400	48,100	49,700	52,400	55,200

Group B (0.76 to 1.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	9,000	13,700	14,500	15,300	16,100
4 Div.	20,000	29,700	31,000	32,500	34,000
6 Div.	30,600	45,100	46,700	48,900	51,200

Group C (1.6 to 2.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	10,200	13,500	14,800	15,700
4 Div.	—	22,800	29,500	31,700	33,400
6 Div.	—	35,100	45,000	47,900	50,300

Group D (2.6 to 3.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	9,200	13,700	15,400
4 Div.	—	—	20,100	30,200	33,200
6 Div.	—	—	30,700	46,300	50,200

Group E (3.6 to 4.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C*	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	—	12,300	14,600
4 Div.	—	—	—	28,300	32,100
6 Div.	—	—	—	39,500	48,800

CLASS I

Group F (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and not within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C*	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	—	10,300	14,600
4 Div.	—	—	—	22,900	32,100
6 Div.	—	—	—	34,900	49,000

CLASS II

Group G (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C*	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	—	13,100	13,400
4 Div.	—	—	—	28,300	33,700
6 Div.	—	—	—	45,200	51,200

CLASS III

DIVIDED/UNDIVIDED ADJUSTMENTS

(alter corresponding two-way arterial volume indicated percent)

Lanes	Median	Left Turn Bays	Adjustment Factor
2	Divided	Yes	- 5%
2	Undivided	No	- 15%
Multi	Undivided	Yes	- 5%
Multi	Undivided	No	- 20%

FREEWAYS

Group 1 (within urbanized area over 500,000 and leading to or within 5 miles of primary city central business district)

Lanes	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
4	27,800	42,800	61,100	73,800	79,300
6	41,700	64,300	91,800	110,700	119,000
8	55,500	85,700	122,200	147,600	158,700
10	69,400	107,100	152,700	184,500	198,400

Group 2 (within urbanized area over 50,000 and not in Group 1)

Lanes	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
4	21,400	33,000	47,100	56,900	61,100
6	32,100	49,500	70,600	85,300	91,700
8	42,800	66,000	94,200	113,700	122,300
10	53,500	82,500	117,700	142,200	152,900

Group 3 (within non-urbanized areas)

Lanes	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
4	17,100	26,300	37,600	45,400	48,800
6	25,600	39,500	56,300	68,000	73,200
8	34,100	52,700	75,100	90,700	97,500

ONE-WAY ARTERIALS

Group D (less than 3.6 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B	C	D	E
2	—	9,800	14,800	16,900	18,000
3	—	14,900	22,700	25,600	27,200
4	—	19,900	30,800	34,300	38,300

CLASS I

Group E (3.6 to 4.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	13,300	16,200	17,600
3	—	—	20,300	24,800	26,600
4	—	—	27,100	33,300	35,600

Group F (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and not within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	10,900	15,600	17,700
3	—	—	16,600	23,900	26,800
4	—	—	22,400	32,400	35,900

CLASS II

Group G (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	13,300	17,200	18,000
3	—	—	20,400	26,200	27,700
4	—	—	27,600	35,200	37,100

CLASS III

TWO-WAY COLLECTORS AND LOCAL STREETS

(signalized intersection analysis)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	7,700	11,600	12,900
4	—	—	16,200	24,300	26,400
6	—	—	24,900	37,200	40,100

* The table does not constitute a standard and should be used only for general planning applications. The computer models from which this table is derived should be used for more specific planning applications. The table and deriving computer models should not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more refined techniques exist. Values shown are average daily traffic maximum volumes (based on peak hour volumes) for levels of service and are based on the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual and Florida traffic data. Roadways with more than the number of lanes shown should be treated on a case by case basis. The table's input value assumptions and level of service criteria appear on the back.

* Cannot be achieved.

Source: Florida Department of Transportation, 1988.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Lodi Public Transit should begin a three phase gradual program for implementing both demand-response and fixed route transit service for Lodi residents. Implemented over a five year period, the phased program will consist of the following elements:

- Phase I - Develop/Implement Transition Strategy, July 1992 through June 1994. This phase will consist of acquiring larger vehicles for the existing demand-response system, improving the dispatch system, hiring additional staff, initiating Sunday and passenger reservation/subscription service goal is to reduce passenger wait time from 45 to no longer than 30 minutes.

- Phase II - Prepare an Operational Plan, July 1993 through June 1994. The plan will include detail on proposed fixed routes, scheduling and equipment requirements, farebox structure, estimates of capital and operating costs, marketing and promotion, and how fixed route service will operate. The plan should also discuss how best to integrate the fixed route and demand-response transit services.

- Phase III - Implement Fixed Route and Demand-Response Service, July 1994 through June 1937. The fixed route service will initially consist of six vehicles operating on three routes. Lodi Public Transit will need *to* closely monitor both fixed route and demand-response ridership and system costs.

Certification Statement

Staff

This 1992 self-certification was prepared by:
(year)

David Morimoto
Name

Community Pevelopment, City of Lodi
Department, Jurisdiction

(209) 333-6711
Phone Number

Based upon the self-certification checklist and the attached documentation, staff is of the opinion that City of Lodi has conformed *to* the requirements of the
(jurisdiction)
Congestion Management Program.

By: David Morimoto
(Signature)

July 8, 1992
(Date)

Governing Body

The Lodi City Council has reviewed the completed checklist and
(governing body)

supporting documentation and has found that the policies and actions of the jurisdiction as reported herein comply to the requirements for conformance with the Congestion Management Program for San Joaquin County.

Certified: _____ Date: July 15, 1992

Alice M. Reimche
City Clerk
Title: _____

Attest: Alice M. Reimche
City/County Clerk

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PLAN
Self-Certification Checklist

Designated CMF System

1. Are there any principal arterial segments that might be considered for addition to the CMP regional transportation system? If yes, please add to the attached conformance documentation.

No.

Level *of* Service Standards

2. Are all level of service calculations for principal arterial segments for which the jurisdiction is listed as "lead entity" (or which fall primarily within its jurisdiction) included in the attached documentation?

Yes. See attached **A-1** and Table **1**

3. Do any of these calculations indicate a **LOS** below the standard before interregional travel has been removed?

NO.

4. Are all facility changes that may affect level **of** service calculations on the CMP system included in the attached documentation?

N/A

Transit Standards

5. Is all information verifying compliance with routing, frequency and coordination standards included in the attached documentation?

No. Lodi currently meets the City's transit needs by providing general public dial-a-ride service. This service is available weekdays from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and weekends from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The service is available to the general public, although the majority of riders are elderly or handicapped certified. The average daily trip count for **1991** was 310 passengers.

The City has recently received a Transit Needs and Assessment and Systems Plan done by a consultant. The City is in the process of evaluating the report to determine the direction of future transit plans. The City will probably phase into a fixed-route bus system over a **4-6** year period. This will be done in conjunction with an expansion and modernization of the dial-a-ride system. Attached is a copy of the recommendations **made by** the transit report (attachment B-1). This **will** be the basis for future transit discussions.

6. Are there any standards that the jurisdiction is having difficulty complying with or believes that it should not be required to comply with? If so, explain in the attached documentation.

Yes. Because the City of Lodi does not have a transit system other than dial-a-ride, it is difficult for the City to respond to many of the transit based standards. The City is currently studying expanded transit service for future years.

7. Have policies for facilities coordination, new/reconstructed streets and long-range transit needs been adopted by the jurisdiction as of dune 30, 1992? Will implementation prlicies proceed according to a regular schedule after that date?

No. The City has not adopted specific transit standards as of June 30, 1992. This is in large part due to the fact that the City has just recently received a draft of the "City of Lodi Transit Needs Assessment and System Plan" report. Once this report is analyzed and discussed, the City will be in the position to adopt specific long-range transit standards. Once this is done, the City will also adopt a specific time table for implementation of the adopted policies.

Land Use Analysis Program

8. Have all land use decisions requiring CMA review been submitted to the CMA as part of the local environmental review process? (e.g. General plan amendments with 1,000 or more additional average daily trips, general plan revisions, cumulative total of all genera1 plan amendments).

Yes. The City of Lodi has not processed any General Plan amendments that exceed the 1,000 or more additional ADT's threshold.

9. Have all significant impacts of the individual 1,000 additional trip general plan revisions been mitigated? Has documentation of the proposed mitigations and their estimated costs been submitted to the CMA?

N/A.

Trip Reduction and Travel Demand Element

10. Is a description of all transportation control measures in place or underway included in the attached documentation?

No. The City of Lodi is waiting for Transportation Control Measures (TCM) plan being prepared by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Once this plan is published and adopted, the City will adopt a trip reduction ordinance.

Capital Improvement Program

11. Is a list of all projects requiring state Flexible Congestion Relief, Traffic System Management or Urban Commuter Rail funds included in the attached documentation? Jurisdictions may also wish to include projects applying for Transit Capital Improvement program funds on this list.

No. No projects are currently being funded by this program.

12. Is a list of all projects on the CMP system that the jurisdiction believes will increase roadway capacity or person capacity (transit) included in the attached documentation?

N/A.

13. Is the information in these project lists given in the Regional Transportation Program format, in priority order, with estimated costs and all proposed funding sources?

N/A.

Regional Model Analysis

14. Does the jurisdiction wish to use its own regional model to perform CMP forecasts and analysis? If so, has the CMA approved the use of the model?

NO.

Deficiency Plans

15. Has the CMA indicated that the jurisdiction must prepare a deficiency plan for a current or projected level of service deficiency? If so, please list the segments(s) lor which a plan was required and when the plans(s) were submitted to the CMA. Were these required plans accepted by the CMA? If no, explain why.

No.

LOS Calc. Sheet

Hutchins Street - Harney Lane to Kettleman Lane

Use urban, two-way arterials, Group C

AWT

S/Kettleman Lane 14,991

1992 Median ANT = 14991

LOS A (per Table 1)

Lower Sacramento Road - Kettleman Lane to Turner Road

Use urban, two-way arterials, Group B

ANT

S/Vine Street 12,413

1992 Median AWT = 12,413

LOS B (per Table 1)

TABLE 1

GENERALIZED DAILY LEVEL OF SERVICE MAXIMUM VOLUMES

FOR FLORIDA'S URBAN/URBANIZED (5,000+) AREAS

(Values for use from January 1989 through December 1990)

TWO-WAY ARTERIALS

Group A (0.0 to 0.75 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	13,700	15,000	15,600	16,500	17,400
4 Div.	29,800	31,900	33,000	34,900	36,700
6 Div.	45,400	48,100	49,700	52,400	55,200

Group B (0.76 to 1.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	9,000	13,700	14,500	15,300	16,100
4 Div.	20,000	29,700	31,000	32,500	34,000
6 Div.	30,600	45,100	46,700	48,900	51,200

Group C (1.6 to 2.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	10,200	13,500	14,800	15,700
4 Div.	—	22,800	29,500	31,700	33,400
6 Div.	—	35,100	45,000	47,900	50,300

Group D (2.6 to 3.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	9,200	13,700	15,400
4 Div.	—	—	20,100	30,200	33,200
6 Div.	—	—	30,700	46,300	50,200

Group E (3.6 to 4.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C*	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	—	12,300	14,600
4 Div.	—	—	—	26,300	32,100
6 Div.	—	—	—	39,500	48,800

CLASS I

Group F (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and not within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C*	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	—	10,300	14,600
4 Div.	—	—	—	22,800	32,100
6 Div.	—	—	—	34,900	49,000

CLASS II

Group G (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes/ Divided	Level of Service A*	B*	C*	D	E
2 Undiv.	—	—	—	13,100	15,400
4 Div.	—	—	—	28,300	33,700
6 Div.	—	—	—	43,200	51,200

CLASS III

DIVIDED/UNDIVIDED ADJUSTMENTS

(alter corresponding two-way arterial volume indicated percent)

Lanes	Median	Left Turn Bays	Adjustment Factor
2	Divided	Yes	- 5%
2	Undivided	No	- 15%
Multi	Undivided	Yes	- 5%
Multi	Undivided	No	- 20%

FREEWAYS

Group 1 (within urbanized area over 500,000 and leading to or within 5 miles of primary city central business district)

Lanes	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
4	27,800	42,800	61,100	73,800	79,300
6	41,700	64,300	91,800	110,700	119,000
8	55,500	85,700	122,200	147,600	158,700
10	69,400	107,100	152,700	184,500	198,400

Group 2 (within urbanized area over 50,000 and not in Group 1)

Lanes	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
4	21,400	33,000	47,100	56,900	61,100
6	32,100	49,500	70,600	85,300	91,700
8	42,800	66,000	94,200	113,700	122,300
10	53,500	82,500	117,700	142,200	152,900

Group 3 (within non-urbanized areas)

Lanes	Level of Service A	B	C	D	E
4	17,100	26,300	37,600	45,400	48,800
6	25,600	39,500	56,300	68,000	73,200
8	34,100	52,700	75,100	90,700	97,500

ONE-WAY ARTERIALS

Group D (less than 3.6 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B	C	D	E
2	—	9,800	14,800	18,900	18,000
3	—	14,900	22,700	25,600	27,200
4	—	18,900	30,800	34,300	36,300

CLASS I

Group E (3.6 to 4.5 signalized intersections per mile)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	13,300	16,200	17,800
3	—	—	20,300	24,800	26,600
4	—	—	27,100	33,300	35,600

Group F (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and not within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	10,900	15,600	17,700
3	—	—	16,600	23,900	26,800
4	—	—	22,400	22,400	35,900

CLASS II

Group G (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	13,300	17,200	18,300
3	—	—	20,400	26,200	27,700
4	—	—	27,600	35,200	37,100

CLASS III

TWO-WAY COLLECTORS AND LOCAL STREETS

(signalized intersection analysis)

Lanes	Level of Service A*	B*	C	D	E
2	—	—	7,700	11,600	12,900
4	—	—	16,200	24,300	26,400
6	—	—	24,900	37,200	40,100

* The table does not constitute a standard and should be used only for general planning applications. The computer models from which this table is derived should be used for more specific planning applications. The table and deriving computer models should not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more refined techniques exist. Values shown are average daily traffic maximum volumes (based on peak hour volumes) for levels of service and are based on the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual and Florida traffic data. Roadways with more than the number of lanes shown should be treated on a case by case basis. The table's input value assumptions and level of service criteria appear on the back.

* Cannot be achieved.

Source: Florida Department of Transportation, 1988.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Lodi Public Transit should begin a three phase gradual program for implementing both demand-response ard fixed route transit service for Lodi residents. Implemented over a five year period, the phased program will consist of the following elements:

- Phase I - Develop/Implement Transition Strategy, July 1992 through June 1994. This phase will consist of acquiring larger vehicles for the existing demand-response system, improving the dispatch system, hiring additional staff, initiating Sunday and passenger reservation/subscription service goal is to reduce passenger wait time from 45 to no longer than 30 minutes.

- Phase II - Prepare an Operational Plan, July 1993 through June 1994. The plan will include detail on proposed fixed routes, scheduling and equipment requirements, farebox structure, estimates of capital and operating costs, marketing and promotion, and how fixed route service will operate. The plan should also discuss how best to integrate the fixed route and demand-response transit services.

- Phase III - Implement Fixed Route and Demand-Response Service, July 1994 through June 1997. The fixed route service will initially consist of six vehicles operating on three routes. Lodi Public Transit will need to closely monitor both fixed route and demand-response ridership and system costs.